DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 391 PS 003 657

TITLE	The Sample: Children Tested in 1969 Operations in the Head Start Year. Disadvantaged Children and their First School Experiences, ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	OEO-4206
PUB DATE	Feb 70
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.15
DESCRIPTORS	Data Collection, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Experience, Family School Relationship, *Interaction Process Analysis, Longitudinal Studies, *Measurement Goals, *Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This report, the third in a series, describes a Head Start longitudinal study of the complex interactions that may take place among child, family, community and program variables. Chapter 1 describes the initial longitudinal sample, based upon information on sex, race, Head Start enrollment, and socioeconomic status. Analyses are given of mothers' and fathers' education and occupation. Chapter 2 gives an account of data collection during the current year of the study, when the children were first enrolled in Head Start classes. The study design calls for two lines of investigation: follow-up of the longitudinal sample, and study of appropriate cross-sectional groups (kindergarten through grade 3). The Personal Record of School Experience (PROSE) and the Classroom Observational Rating Scale (Personality) were used throughout the program year to record the children's relationships with peers, teachers, and classroom materials. The children were tested also on a variety of measures of mental, motor, and personality development. Additional data were collected from parent interviews and classroom observations. Teacher and school administrator questionnaires are in preparation. The cross-sectional study had not been done at the time of this report. (NH)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OE EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PR-70-2

ERIC
F-UEO
PS

ED043391

DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND THEIR FIRST SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study

The Sample: Children Tested in 1969

Operations in the Head Start Year

Report under

Grant Number H-8256

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Educational Testing Service TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

February 1970

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

COPYRIGHT © 1970 BY EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

PS 003657

This is the third in a series of reports describing progress made under Contract OEO 4206 and Grants CG-8256 and H 8256. The first (PR-68-4) treated the theoretical considerations underlying the design and measurements proposed for the six-year study of disadvantaged children and their earliest school experiences. The second (PR-69-12) described the test and interview operations that introduced children and their families to the study in 1969--before any of the children were enrolled in Head Start programs.

The present report provides an up-to-date account of data collection taking place during the first full year of the study (1969-70) when some children in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton are in Head Start. (In Lee County, the full-year Head Start program will not be available to study subjects until next year, immediately preceding grade 1.) This report also includes a description of the initial longitudinal sample, based upon information obtained in 1969 on sex, race, Head Start enrollment, and aspects of socioeconomic status. This description will be subject to some modification, in the direction of greater precision, as further checks are made and additional data collected in 1969-70 is added.

The next report, scheduled for summer 1970, will focus on initial differences and similarities between the children who enrolled in Head Start in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton and those who did not. Family characteristics will be included in the analyses.

Scarvia Anderson

Princeton, New Jersey

March 2, 1970

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	The Sample: Children Tested in 1969 Albert Beaton	9
2.	Operations in the Head Start Year Virginia Shipman	27

Appendices

A.	Guidelines for Data Access	45
B.	Project Personnel	51
C.	Bibliography	55

4|5|6|7|8

Table 1

THE SAMPLE: DEFINED BY SITE, RACE, AND ATTENDANCE AT HEAD START

	Head Start		Non Head Start
PORTLAND			
B	138		220
W	32		149
Others*		(14)	
	170		369
ST. LOUIS			
B	60		138
W	24		35
Others		(12)	
	84		173
TRENTON			
B	96		197
W	3		63
Others		(10)	
	99		260

TOTALS	(excluding Lee County)				LEE COUNTY	TOTALS
B	294		555	849	269	1118
W	59		247	306	236	542
Others		(36)			(2)	(38)
	353	(36)	802	1155	505	1660
						38
						1698

*These are children of races other than black or white (see PR-68-4, page A-3).

The Sample: Children Tested in 1969

Albert Beaton

The longitudinal sample for the Study of Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experiences was taken in school districts in which Head Start was available in four different cities of the country (see PR-69-12, p. 114). The basic sample is tabulated in Table 1, which breaks down the total sample by site, race, and the childrens' attendance in Head Start. Note that the children in the Auburn site have not had the opportunity to attend Head Start (Head Start is offered in lieu of kindergarten there) so are not included in the summary tabulation. It is important to note that at this time the figure for attendance at Head Start is minimum since the only children put into this category are those who are reported registered in a Head Start Center in our districts. Thus, children moving from a site who may be attending Head Start elsewhere and those attending Head Start at some distance from their home would be incorrectly categorized as not going to Head Start at this time; the interview information collected this year will sharpen this categorization and also identify children in similar preschool programs not under the aegis of Head Start.

Several analyses have been done to explore the possibility of differences in the socioeconomic status of the parents of these children, and, in particular, differences between the black and white children and between those who attend Head Start and those who do not. We have four variables which are often components of socioeconomic status, although we do not have the family income which is, of course, also a major component.* The first analysis was of parents' education and is shown in

---

*Family income information is being collected in spring 1970.

Table 2. The upper part of this table contains the mean number of years of education for the fathers of the sample children for whom such information was available or reported by the mother. The mean number of years overall was 11, based on a sample of 730 fathers. This table shows that the fathers of the black children in the sample have an average of one and one-half years less education than the fathers of the white children; also, the parents of the children attending Head Start have about a year less education than those whose children do not attend, though this difference is more pronounced for black children than for white.

The lower part of Table 2 is an equivalent table for the number of years of schooling for the mothers of these children, and the same pattern is apparent.

A closer look at the distribution of the number of years of education is shown in Table 3. We note that the distributions differ substantially in the tails. The white sample has 12 fathers who have attended graduate school (9 with the equivalent of a Ph.D) and 8 mothers who went beyond the bachelor's degree, whereas the black sample holds but 2 fathers and 1 mother above the bachelor's level. This indicates that perhaps the simple average is not the best measure of central tendency and that the median or mid-mean might be a better statistic for comparison. Such will be computed when the sample information is sharpened.

Tables 4 and 5 contain an equivalent breakdown of fathers' and mothers' occupations. Occupation was coded with a three-digit code used by the Bureau of Census. For our purposes here, occupations are divided into white collar and blue collar jobs. We note that a larger proportion

of the fathers of the white children are employed in white collar jobs than the fathers of the black children and that a larger proportion of the fathers of the black children are unemployed. A larger proportion of the mothers of the white children are employed in white collar jobs, but nearly three-quarters of the white women are not employed as opposed to 57% of the black.

Table 6 contains a more refined breakdown of the occupations of parents. Tables 7-14 present further breakdowns of father's occupation and mother's education by site and sex and race of child.

It is emphasized that the data presented herein is subject to modification as a result of further checks now being made in the field together with the collection of additional data.

Table 2

MEAN NUMBER OF YEARS OF EDUCATION

OF PARENTS

(in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton)

	Head Start	Non Head Start	Total Group
FATHERS			
B	9.97 (N=152)	10.76 (N=337)	10.51 (N=489)
W	11.82 (N=39)	12.04 (N=202)	12.00 (N=241)
	10.35 (N=191)	11.24 (N=539)	11.00 (N=730)
MOTHERS			
B	10.64 (N=268)	10.89 (N=492)	10.80 (N=760)
W	10.89 (N=45)	11.98 (N=226)	11.80 (N=271)
	10.68 (N=313)	11.23 (N=718)	11.06 (N=1031)

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF YEARS OF

EDUCATION OF PARENTS

(in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton)

		0-6	7-9	10-11	12	13-15	16	17	19	No Info.	Totals
FATHERS											
B	HS	22	30	36	53	10	1	0	0	142	294
	NHS	23	59	76	147	27	3	1	1	218	555
W	HS	1	8	7	13	3	5	0	2	20	59
	NHS	8	30	36	62	30	26	3	7	45	247
MOTHERS											
B	HS	14	44	96	104	10	0	0	0	26	294
	NHS	19	86	151	194	33	8	1	0	63	555
W	HS	1	11	13	15	4	0	0	1	14	59
	NHS	3	23	54	90	34	15	6	1	21	247

Table 4

FATHER'S OCCUPATION

WHITE COLLAR JOBS vs. NOT EMPLOYED[a]

(in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton)

		Head Start	Non Head Start	Total Group
% IN WHITE COLLAR JOBS OF THOSE EMPLOYED	B	13.0 (N=123)	15.0 (N=292)	14.4 (N=415)
	W	50.0 (N=30)	41.8 (N=196)	42.9 (N=226)
		20.2 (N=153)	25.8 (N=488)	24.4 (N=641)
% NOT EMPLOYED OF THOSE FOR WHOM INFORMATION AVAILABLE	B	12.7 (N=141)	9.3 (N=322)	10.3 (N=463)
	W	21.0 (N=38)	3.4 (N=203)	5.9 (N=241)
		14.5 (N=179)	7.0 (N=525)	8.9 (N=704)

a. Shown as percentages of the group Ns given in parentheses.

Table 5

MOTHER'S OCCUPATION:

WHITE COLLAR JOBS vs. NOT EMPLOYED[a]

(in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton)

		Head Start	Non Head Start	Total Group
% IN WHITE COLLAR JOBS OF THOSE EMPLOYED	B	24.7 (N=85)	33.2 (N=220)	30.8 (N=305)
	W	33.3 (N=9)	55.7 (N=61)	52.9 (N=70)
		25.5 (N=94)	38.1 (N=281)	34.9 (N=375)
% NOT EMPLOYED OF THOSE FOR WHOM INFORMATION AVAILABLE	B	66.1 (N=251)	52.2 (N=460)	57.1 (N=711)
	W	79.5 (N=44)	72.0 (N=218)	73.3 (N=262)
		68.1 (N=295)	58.5 (N=678)	61.5 (N=973)

a. Shown as percentages of the group Ns given in parentheses.

Table 6

PARENTS' OCCUPATIONS

(in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton)

	FATHER				MOTHER			
	B		W		B		W	
	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS
Professional	6	17	6	27	1	19	1	10
Farm Owners & Managers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managers and Proprietors	3	11	3	28	2	3	0	2
Clerical	6	13	0	12	16	51	2	17
Sales	1	3	6	15	2	0	0	5
Craftsmen	22	50	6	37	0	7	0	2
Operatives	42	101	6	51	10	37	1	6
Services	19	39	3	10	51	98	5	13
Farm Laborers	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laborers	23	58	0	16	3	5	0	6
Not employed	18	30	8	7	166	240	35	157
No information	153	233	21	44	43	95	15	29
	294	555	59	247	294	555	59	247

Table 7

FATHER'S OCCUPATION: LEE COUNTY

(by sex and race of child)

	Male		Female		Total	
	B	W	B	W	B	W
Professional	1	50	0	44	1	94
Farm Owners and Managers	0	2	0	1	0	3
Managers and Proprietors	0	16	2	14	2	30
Clerical	4	1	1	1	5	2
Sales	0	5	10	3	10	8
Craftsmen	11	27	0	17	11	44
Operators	34	10	21	18	55	28
Service	12	3	16	4	28	7
Farm Laborers	3	0	0	0	3	0
Laborers	24	2	19	2	43	4
Not Employed	5	2	3	7	8	9
No Information	59	3	44	4	103	7
	153	121	116	115	269	236
	274		231		505	

Table 8

FATHER'S OCCUPATION: PORTLAND

(by sex and race of child)

	Male				Female				Total			
	B		W		B		W		B		W	
	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS
Professional	4	10	4	11	2	4	1	8	6	14	5	19
Farm Owners and Managers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managers and Proprietors	1	5	2	3	1	3	0	16	2	8	2	19
Clerical	2	4	0	7	1	3	0	4	3	7	0	11
Sales	1	2	2	5	0	1	0	7	1	3	2	12
Craftsmen	7	19	1	13	6	15	5	9	13	34	6	22
Operators	11	26	1	15	10	17	2	16	21	43	3	31
Service	5	7	1	1	4	4	2	3	9	11	3	4
Farm Laborers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laborers	7	14	0	4	7	7	0	4	14	21	0	8
Not Employed	2	7	1	2	5	5	2	1	7	12	3	3
No Information	31	40	3	8	31	27	5	12	62	67	8	20
	71	134	15	69	67	86	17	80	138	220	32	149
	205		84		153		97		358		181	
	289				250				539			

Table 9

FATHER'S OCCUPATION: ST. LOUIS

(by sex and race of child)

	Male				Female				Total			
	B		W		B		W		B		W	
	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farm Owners and Managers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managers and Proprietors	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Clerical	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Sales	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Craftsmen	1	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	3	4	0	4
Operators	5	8	0	5	3	9	2	4	8	17	2	9
Service	0	8	0	0	1	4	0	1	1	12	0	1
Farm Laborers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laborers	0	8	0	4	0	8	0	1	0	16	0	5
Not Employed	6	6	1	1	2	1	4	1	8	7	5	2
No Information	20	42	6	9	18	39	6	5	38	81	12	14
	33	74	12	21	27	64	12	14	60	138	24	35
	107		33		91		26		198		59	
	140				117				257			

Table 10

FATHER'S OCCUPATION: TRENTON

(by sex and race of child)

	Male				Female				Total			
	B		W		B		W		B		W	
	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS
Professional	0	1	1	5	0	2	0	3	0	3	1	8
Farm Owners and Managers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managers and Proprietors	0	2	0	7	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	9
Clerical	1	3	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	5	0	1
Sales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Craftsmen	3	5	0	6	3	7	0	5	6	12	0	11
Operators	6	16	1	6	7	25	0	5	13	41	1	11
Service	6	10	0	2	3	6	0	3	9	16	0	5
Farm Laborers	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Laborers	4	14	0	0	5	7	0	3	9	21	0	3
Not employed	1	7	0	1	2	4	0	1	3	11	0	2
No Information	28	43	0	6	25	42	1	4	53	85	1	10
	49	101	2	34	47	96	1	29	96	197	3	63
	150		36		143		30		293		66	
	186				173				359			

Table 11

MOTHER'S EDUCATION: LEE COUNTY

(by sex and race of child)

Years of Education	Male		Female		Total	
	B	W	B	W	B	W
0-6	22	1	17	2	39	3
7-9	61	9	31	10	92	19
10-11	50	16	31	18	81	34
12	20	46	28	42	48	88
13-15	0	17	0	19	0	36
16	0	23	1	14	1	37
17	0	6	0	2	0	8
19	0	0	0	7	0	7
No Information	0	3	8	1	8	4
	153	121	116	115	269	236
	274		231		505	

Table 12

MOTHER'S EDUCATION: PORTLAND

(by sex and race of child)

Years of Education	Male				Female				Total			
	B		W		B		W		B		W	
	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS
0-6	2	6	0	0	3	2	0	0	5	8	0	0
7-9	6	14	1	2	5	8	3	6	11	22	4	8
10-11	23	32	2	15	23	20	5	16	46	52	7	31
12	32	59	8	29	34	42	6	34	66	101	14	63
13-15	6	18	3	13	2	9	1	11	8	27	4	24
16	0	1	0	7	0	4	0	5	0	5	0	12
17	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	1	0	6
19	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
No Information	2	4	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	4	2	4
	71	134	15	69	67	86	17	80	138	220	32	149
	205		84		153		97		358		181	
	289				250				539			

Table 13

MOTHER'S EDUCATION: ST. LOUIS

(by sex and race of child)

Years of Education	Male				Female				Total			
	B		W		B		W		B		W	
	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS
0-6	2	4	1	0	3	2	0	2	5	6	1	2
7-9	5	11	2	6	2	17	5	2	7	28	7	8
10-11	10	24	3	6	7	15	1	3	17	39	4	9
12	7	10	1	1	6	10	0	1	13	20	1	2
13-15	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Information	9	24	5	8	8	20	6	5	17	44	11	13
	33	74	12	21	27	64	12	14	60	138	24	35
	107		33		91		26		198		59	
	140				117				257			

24/25/26

Table 14

MOTHER'S EDUCATION: TRENTON

(by sex and race of child)

Years of Education	Male				Female				Total			
	B		W		B		W		B		W	
	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS	HS	NHS
0-6	1	3	0	1	3	2	0	0	4	5	0	1
7-9	14	19	0	4	12	17	0	3	26	36	0	7
10-11	15	34	2	8	18	26	0	6	33	60	2	14
12	13	35	0	11	12	38	0	14	25	73	0	25
13-15	1	2	0	5	0	3	0	4	1	5	0	9
16	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	3
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Information	5	8	0	3	2	7	1	1	7	15	1	4
	49	101	2	34	47	96	1	29	96	197	3	63
	150		36		143		30		293		66	
	186				173				359			

OPERATIONS IN THE HEAD START YEAR

Virginia Shipman

The overall study design calls for two major lines of investigation in 1969-70: follow-up of the longitudinal sample measured during the first year of the study and the study of appropriate cross-sectional groups (kindergarten through grade 3). The marked increase in data collection activities in the second year of operation requires a complex and demanding schedule. With the exception of Lee County, Alabama, the majority of our study children are eligible to attend Head Start classes. Consequently, the study design calls for a variety of procedures that will enable us to describe the complex interactions that may take place among child, family, community and program variables.

Child Observations

Our first activities centered upon those observational procedures that would be utilized throughout the program year, the Personal Record of School Experience (PROSE) and the Classroom Observational Rating Scale (Personality). Since these measures have been described in detail elsewhere (see the December 1968 and August 1969 reports), it will not be necessary to elaborate here upon their content or rationale. It should be remembered, however, that both procedures focus on the individual child -- on his relationships with his peers, his teachers, and the materials available in the classroom. While first year testing activities in the four sites were still in process, plans were completed for training PROSE and Personality

observers: manuals were printed, trainees were recruited by local coordinators, video-tapes for training were prepared, and travel plans were arranged. Time tables were tight; in Portland, St. Louis, and Trenton testing terminated on October 3 and personality observation training was scheduled to begin on October 6.

As was stated in the August report, to the extent possible, training in the second year would be carried out locally by local staff. Consequently, one person each from Portland, Trenton and St. Louis was brought to Princeton the last week in September, to be trained as Head Personality Trainer, following which each one was to spend two weeks at home training 10-12 trainees recruited by the local coordinator and selected by the Princeton training staff. One of the head trainers was a former tester, one a former test center supervisor and one a young woman new to the project, but with teaching and Peace Corps experience. Many of the trainees were former testers; in Trenton some women who had worked on the pilot study were still available. In the local sites, as in Princeton, training focused on a careful review of behavioral definitions, followed by practice observations in preschool classrooms, at first done singly and then in pairs. The Princeton trainers benefited from their experiences in training observers for the earlier pilot study. While training was in progress, local coordinators were to complete the identification of those children attending Head Start who, according to their birthdate and residence, were eligible to attend first grade in 1971 in the designated target schools.

While the training of personality observers continued in the sites, PROSE training began in Princeton. Since PROSE requires only 2-3 persons

per site all training was done in Princeton. Videotaped training films could thus be used in addition to actual practice observations in preschool classrooms. Most of the trainees were former testers; one had administered the parent interview for Audits and Surveys and another had been an observer for the PROSE pilot study in Trenton. Following training, one observer for each site was designated Senior PROSE Observer, requiring her to be responsible for scheduling observers and for other clerical duties in addition to her regular observer duties.

During the first few weeks of field activities, communication lines with Princeton staff were kept as open as possible. Daily telephone calls were made. Definitions of observed behaviors needed re-examination, scheduling problems emerged, training was a new and difficult task for the personality head trainer and presented various interpersonal problems. And for all, the knowledge that Princeton was really standing by, that this is not a "we" and "they" situation, that the local office is not "out on its own" was, in the beginning, continually restated and, it is hoped, experienced. Where the need was mutually felt, a Princeton trainer visited the local site during training to provide additional consultation and advice.

While training progressed the local coordinator and personality head trainer met with local Head Start staff to explain the procedures and to arrange for scheduling observations. To facilitate coordination of PROSE and Personality observers' classroom visits, the personality head trainer was assigned to schedule both, taking into account various local needs (e.g., St. Louis Head Start classes do not meet on Friday; in Trenton one must avoid scheduling both PROSE and personality observations on the same day that college students in education are also observing; in all sites, certain

days are set aside for field trips). The study staff is greatly indebted to the many teachers and administrators who have been so very cooperative and helpful during the past several months.*

Personality ratings were planned to begin in mid-October. In Trenton and Portland they did. St. Louis, however, required an additional month to recruit the necessary number of trainees. Our local coordinator was new, and it was necessary that he give his immediate attention and time to improving community-project relations and completing tasks remaining from the first year's activities. This delay in training resulted in our bringing the head personality trainer back to Princeton for a week's retraining and review of the observation procedures.

Pairs of observers visited each Head Start classroom attended by an eligible child until all children so designated had been observed twice, approximately two weeks apart, during a 30-minute free play period. (Since observations could not commence until December in St. Louis, only one paired observation was made there in the fall-winter period.) In those classrooms attended by 60% or more eligible study children, the remaining classmates were observed also. To the extent possible, half of each class was rated twice in October-November and half in December-January, enabling the observation of children at varying points during the Head Start year, while at the same time providing a sizable number of children who were observed during their first two months of Head Start experience. Observers work in pairs and each first makes independent ratings which are then compared. Any differences found in the ratings are discussed and resolved to reach

*The meeting called in Washington by the Head Start office where ETS staff met with representatives from the four sites to discuss the planned activities in the classroom was particularly helpful.

consensus. During the early days of observations these discussions are closely monitored by the head trainer. Subsequently, she makes only periodic spot checks to control quality. Rater agreements have been uniformly high during the fall observation period.

PROSE observations began in late October and were scheduled for all Head Start classrooms composed of 50% or more study eligible youngsters. To accomodate the teachers, since the observation period covers the entire class day, no classroom, with rare exceptions, was observed more than once a week. PROSE observations are scheduled so that a given class is observed twice in one day in random order by a single observer. The observer, the day of the week on which observations are made, and the random order, change for each class for each daily set of observations.

Before a PROSE or personality observer collected data, however, she visited the assigned classroom, both familiarizing herself with the situation and enabling the children to become used to her presence. As many others have described when reporting on observation procedures, the children soon became used to the "lady with the clipboard." They learn the rules of the game: when the clipboard is in her hand, she is not someone with whom to interact.

Personality and PROSE observations continued through the first week of February (excluding, of course, the days immediately preceding and following a holiday); they will resume again in mid-March. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the number of classrooms and children given personality ratings and observed on PROSE, respectively, in each of the three sites. Missing from these numbers, of course, are the visits when no observations could be made because of an unexpected event, the "snow days," the car that broke down and could

Table 1

PERSONALITY OBSERVATIONS: NUMBER OF CLASSES OBSERVED AND OBSERVATIONS COMPLETED[a]

(to February 13, 1970)

Portland		St. Louis	Trenton		All Sites	
Number of Head Start Classes						
17		18	13		48	
Observations One	Two	Observations One[b]	Observations One	Two	Observations One	Two
15	217	251	16	119	282	336

Number of Day Care Classes						
11		1	6		18	
Observations One	Two	Observations One[b]	Observations One	Two	Observations One	Two
39	50	14	35	23	88	73

Total Number of Classes and Observations						
28		19	19		66	
Observations One	Two	Observations One[b]	Observations One	Two	Observations One	Two
54	267	265	51	142	370	409

a. The numbers reported herein may, in some instances, be somewhat in excess of those in the actual sample because classmates are also observed in classes with 60% or more study children.

b. Children in St. Louis were observed only once.

Table 2

COMPLETED PROSE OBSERVATIONS

(to February 13, 1970)

Number of completed observations per class[b]	PORTLAND		ST. LOUIS		TRENTON		ALL SITES	
	Number of Classes[a]							
	Head Start	Day Care	Head Start	Day Care	Head Start	Day Care	Head Start	Day Care
	10	6	17	1	8	1	35	8
0-5	-	3[c]	2[d]	1	-	1	2	5
6-10	2	3	11	-	1	-	14	3
11-14	8	-	4	-	6	-	18	-
15	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-

a. Classes with 50% or more study eligible children.

b. 15 observations in each class are planned. Table shows, by the groupings in this column, progress towards this goal.

c. PROSE observations will not resume in these Day Care centers.

d. These classes were dropped during the winter by Head Start.

not get an observer to a classroom before free play was over, the continued absentee whom an observer hopes to "catch," the sudden arrival of a group of visitors who make the day too atypical, etc.

Several major project decisions have been made since observations began. Previously, we had always referred to children who did or did not attend Head Start. There was an implicit assumption that if the child did not attend Head Start he remained at home; obviously this is not necessarily the case. Consequently, we revised our instructions to refer to children attending any preschool program. Local coordinators diligently searched the classified telephone listings and contacted various agencies and individuals who might provide names of such programs. Once located, rosters were checked against eligibility requirements for inclusion in the sample. Parents were often a major help in getting permission to observe in these non-Head Start programs. It is to be hoped that most children attending preschool have been located. In any case, the parent interview will enable us to identify those families who sent their children to Head Start, those who sent them to other preschool programs, and those who did not send them to any program.

This particular policy change affected PROSE only slightly, since there were only a few non-Head Start classes with 50% or more eligible children. The financial crises realized in November and December, however, affected both observational procedures. PROSE was cut to 15 observation half-days per class (from 20) and was once again restricted to Head Start only. Instead of double paired observations in the spring, personality ratings will be made on the basis of one paired observation.

Since there will be at least a four weeks pause in observing, several days will be spent in reviewing procedures and doing practice observations before starting spring observations. For PROSE, an on-site reliability check by a Princeton trainer will be done as part of this retraining period.

Child Test Measures

As was explained in the August report, by necessity Year I testing continued until October. With the cooperation of the local Head Start Centers, those children registered for Head Start were seen first, before their entrance into the Head Start class. This schedule delay, however, did require Princeton and Regional Office staff to continue monitoring testing in August and September and to train new testers in 3 out of 4 sites in August.

Development of the 4 1/2-year-old measures continued throughout the fall of 1969 with modifications in procedures piloted on appropriate samples. Several of these modifications resulted from an intensive three-day meeting in August 1969 with two community representatives from each of the four sites to discuss the appropriateness of the measures proposed for testing 4 1/2-year-old children in their respective locales. For example, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was modified to make the items more meaningful for the population under study in terms of racial characteristics and activities pictured; a separate equating study is planned that will enable direct comparison between scores obtained in the first and second years of this study and between scores obtained in this study and other studies. A simpler change was the renaming of the Sex Role Constancy Task as the Boy-Girl Identity Task, a title less controversial and a more accurate description of what the child does.

During December and January manuals and answer sheets were put into final form, utilizing suggestions from previous trainers and testers. Wording was simplified further, format was made more uniform, and special comments referring to frequent errors made in administration and recording were included whenever possible.

Table 3

THE MEASURES AND TESTING SEQUENCE USED IN PORTLAND, ST. LOUIS, AND TRENTON - SPRING 1970

Battery A	Estimated Time (minutes)
*First Day of School Question (Mother)	5
*Hess & Shipman Eight Block Sorting Task	30
Vigor I (Hopping)	5
Stanford Memory Test (Short Term Series)	10
Boy-Girl Identity Task	10
Children's Auditory Discrimination Inventory	10
(Rest-play)	(5)
Preschool Embedded Figures Test	15
Motor Inhibition Test	10
*ETS Story Sequence Task, Parts 1 & 2	20
*Massad Mimicry II	10
Risk Taking, Task 2	5
Battery B	
Sigel Object Categorizing Test	20
Vigor 2 (Crank turning)	5
Fixation Time	20
Naming Category Instances	15
(Rest-play)	(5)
Peabody Picture Voc. Test, ETS adaptation, Forms A & B	20
Spontaneous Numerical Correspondence	5
Gumpgookies	25
Seguin Form Board	5
Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test (Self and Teacher Referents)	15
Battery C	
TAMA General Knowledge Test II	10
Cooperative Preschool Inventory (Caldwell)	20
Form Reproduction	5
Mischel Technique	2
Johns Hopkins Perceptual Test	15
ETS Matched Pictures Lanuguage Comprehension Task II	10
Open Field	(10)
Relevant Redundant Cue Concept Acquisition Task	15
Social Schemata	15
Matching Familiar Figures Test	15
ETS Enumeration II	5
ETS Spatial Egocentrism Task	15

*These tasks are taped.

Tester training is a further extension of the procedure used with the personality observers. A head tester trainer was brought to Princeton for a two-week training period, after which he spent two weeks at home training three tester trainers (one for each battery) who, in turn, trained 30-33 trainees. The head tester trainer and assistant trainers were recruited by the technical director; the local coordinator recruited tester trainees, 30-33 of whom were then selected by the technical director for training. The head tester trainers (1 male, 2 females) have all had graduate work in education or psychology past the master's degree, plus relevant testing experience. The assistant trainers are more varied, but have testing and/or supervisory experience. Since no observations were scheduled for February, the personality head trainers, two of whom had been exceptionally good testers last year, were utilized as assistant tester trainers. For Trenton, previous Princeton trainers were used. To provide possible back-up for absences or Saturday schedules, PROSE and personality observers were eligible to be tester trainees.

Head tester trainers were trained in Princeton January 12-23, with the technical directors joining them for the second week; they then returned to their sites and trained three trainers during the two weeks January 26-February 6 (except in Trenton where only one week was required). Tester training began February 9 (February 2 in Trenton) and is continuing at this time. Children are being scheduled by the local coordinator to come to a testing center for three 2 1/4 hour sessions; for one of these sessions a child will be accompanied by his mother. The present assignment of 4 1/2-year-old measures to the three test batteries is given in Table 3.

Table 4

THE MEASURES AND TESTING SEQUENCE USED IN
LEE COUNTY - SPRING 1970

	Estimated Time (minutes)
ETS Matched Pictures Language Comprehension Task II	10
Cooperative Preschool Inventory (Caldwell)	20
Motor Inhibition Test (Drawing Sub-test)	5
Johns Hopkins Perceptual Test	15
Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test	15
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, ETS Adaptation, Form A	10
Matching Familiar Figures Test	15
ETS Enumeration II	5

Technical directors were appointed in the four sites by December. Immediately thereafter they were brought to Princeton to become familiarized quickly with the project design and personnel and with ETS procedures. Although not available in time to be involved in the training of PROSE or personality observers, they were quickly brought up-to-date on monitoring various aspects of these operations. They became involved immediately, however, in tester training as their first job was to recruit tester trainers.

At the time of training head tester trainers in Princeton, budget restrictions had necessitated deleting Lee County from the testing operations. Since then it has been decided that a modified 1 3/4 hour testing battery will be given there; the measures are listed in Table 4. Consequently, Dr. Phillips, the technical director from Lee County, Alabama, came to Princeton in late February to be trained on the various measures. He is now training four testers (including two former testers) plus two back-up testers in the site.

While training activities progress, testing centers have been located and set up by each local coordinator in consultation with the technical director and head tester trainer. Again, many are located in church buildings. This year, two testing units (rather than three) will be organized, each having assigned to it 9 testers, an interviewer, a test center supervisor, a playroom supervisor, and a driver.

Parent Interview

A parent interview, similar to that used last year, but including reference to parent attitudes toward and involvement in the child's pre-

school program, has been prepared. This year, the mother will be interviewed in the testing center on the day that she comes in for the mother-child interaction task. Interviewers will be selected from the tester trainee pool, after having been trained on test administration and recording skills and observed relating to mothers when practicing the mother-child interaction tasks. Although only two interviewers are required per site, at least five local staff members will be trained on the interview to provide operational flexibility.

Classroom Observations

In addition to PROSE and personality ratings which focus on the individual child, observations focused on the teacher and the class as a whole will also be made. It is now planned that the technical director and/or personality head trainer will make these ratings in March through May in each Head Start classroom in the sample.

Teacher and School Administrator Questionnaires

These measures are now being prepared for printing. The only difference from the description given in the August report is that instead of rating their pupils on the personality observation measures, each teacher will be asked to rate the effectiveness of various techniques for modifying each pupil's behavior. Given a reduction in the amount of time (money) that could be allocated to this area, it was felt that the resulting individuation measure would provide us with more information on the teacher (and, consequently, the "program"). Since the children are actually being

observed by the study staff, the teacher's personality ratings would have served primarily as a measure of the teacher herself. Moreover, such ratings of the children may be expected to be less variable than her ratings of techniques. In her rating of the effectiveness of various techniques the teacher indicates indirectly not only how successful or unsuccessful she feels she has been with the child, but also her expectations of his success in his next learning experience.

Cross-Sectional Measures

We are now in the process of obtaining specific permission* from the various school superintendents to have these tests administered in kindergarten through grade 3. Although the measures are to be group administered, the technical director or one of his training staff will observe how the tasks are actually administered in the classroom.

Data Preparation

Checking, scoring and coding of the data collected through September 1969 has been a continuing process during the fall and winter. Budget restrictions, however, have forced these operations to proceed at a greatly reduced pace.

As scoring and coding manuals have been developed, each answer sheet has been screened for tester errors or other events that might invalidate some or all responses (e.g., presence of the mother in a testing room, or

*General permission for involvement of the school systems was, of course, obtained at the time of site selection.

an improper probe). Each answer sheet is independently coded twice and then spot-checked before sending to key-punching.

Simplified answer sheets, increased space for obtaining tester comments, added emphasis during training on recording exactly what the child and tester said and/or did, and the greatly increased monitoring of testing together with local checking of answer sheets provided by the technical director and head tester trainer should facilitate greatly the preparation of the 1969-70 data.

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for Data Access

Because of our deep concern with the protection of privacy of subjects participating in the ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study it was crucial at this time to prepare a set of guidelines outlining procedures to be followed in regard to requests for access to data. The question is particularly urgent as data collected during the first operational year of the study will soon be coming from the computer.

The following guidelines are offered in the hope that publication will aid the originator of a request for data access to submit it in proper form to allow quick processing by the project staff.

Requests for reprints: All requests for data in published form, e.g., ETS publications, speeches and associated hand-outs, journal articles, will be processed in the usual manner (either by the individual author or through normal organization channels).

Requests from project staff: All requests for data and data analysis will be processed by the Data Analysis Coordinator.

Requests originating from outside ETS and from non-project ETS staff: All requests for data originating from outside ETS and from non-project ETS staff (including results of preliminary analyses or manipulation of raw data), e.g., distributions, means, standard deviations, correlation matrices, that is not already published will be referred to the Project Director who will be

responsible for a ruling on whether the request will be granted. Such a ruling will be made within the framework of the following points:

A. All requests should be received on institutional letterhead.

B. All requests from graduate students should be submitted by their sponsoring professor.

C. All requests from school systems, including those from the four participating school systems, should be submitted by the superintendent of schools.

The three points above will provide the Project Director with knowledge of the source of the request. In addition, and equally important, is knowledge of the use to which the data will be put, hence,

D. All requests must specify the use to which the data will be put.

Requests for access to basic data: Requests for access to basic data, will not be honored by the project staff. However, there may arise instances of a professional nature which would warrant the referral of such a request to the Steering Committee for a ruling.

Requests for access to computer programs: All requests for access to computer programs designed for the study will be processed in a similar manner to requests for access to data. The final judgment will be that of the Data Analysis Coordinator who will inform the Project Director of the decision. However, in no instance will a program be released if it provides a means of identifying a study subject--child, family, school administrator, teacher, community, etc.

Procedure for use of data once permission is granted: In all instances in which a request for data in publishable form (e.g., distributions, means, standard deviations, correlation matrices) is granted, access to the data will be honored only at the Princeton or regional ETS offices. However, in extreme cases the data may be released to the sponsoring professor of a graduate student or to the school superintendent as a surrogate for an ETS office.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT PERSONNEL

Steering Committee: Samuel J. Messick (Chairman), Albert E. Beaton, Walter Emmerich, Edmund W. Gordon, Winton H. Manning, Marshall P. Smith, Silvan S. Tomkins, Melvin Tumin

Project Director: Scarvia B. Anderson
- Project Administrator: Robert Smith, Arthur Benson
- Technical Associate: Samuel Ball
- Technical Assistant: Ann Jungeblut
- Assistant for Communications: Gray Sidwell
- Financial Consultants: Joseph Bianchini, Patricia E. Clyde
- Contract Consultants: Russell W. Martin, Charlotte Farley
- Public Relations Consultants: Thomas M. White, John P. Smith

Logistics and Site Administrator: Joseph L. Boyd, Jr.
- Associate for Field Administration: Samuel Barnett
- Assistant for Field Administration: Virginia Wilson
- Coordinator, Lee County, Alabama: Carolyn Tamblyn
  - Assistant: Mary Jo Frazier
- Coordinator, St. Louis, Missouri: Bobby Westbrooks
  - Assistant: Flavious C. Johnson, Jr.
  - Consultant: Daniel P. Norton
- Coordinator, Portland, Oregon: Verna Shepherd
  - Assistant: Maxine Baker
- Coordinator, Trenton, New Jersey: Conrad McLean
  - Assistant: Roberta K. Fitzgerald

Measurement-Training Coordinator: Virginia Shipman
- Technical Directors: Jack Crawford (Portland), Sharon Creech (Trenton), Arthur Littleton (St. Louis), Ray Phillips (Lee County)
- Associate for Measurement Development: Ruth B. Ekstrom
- Assistant for Measurement-Training: Ann McGoldrick
- Professional Associates for Measurement-Training: Dolores Ahrens, Robert Althauser, Marianne Amarel, Scarvia B. Anderson, Samuel Ball, Gerald Bracey, Anne M. Bussis, Edward Chittenden, Diran Dermen, Walter Emmerich, Robert Feldmesser, Michael Lewis, Carolyn Massad, Donald M. Medley, Jean Orost, Thomas Quirk, Masako N. Tanaka, George Temp, William C. Ward
- Assistants for Measurement-Training: Patricia Casserly, Rosalea Courtney, Karla Goldman, Sandra Landes, Esther Ann Ryan, Phyllis Ward, Patricia Warren, Gita Wilder

Analysis Coordinator: Albert E. Beaton
- Professional Associates for Analysis, Data Handling: F. Reid Creech, Charles Hall, Harry Harman, Frederick Toms, Victor E. Wichert
- Assistants for Analysis, Data Handling: Emily Lewin, Richard J. Martz, Robert Patrick

APPENDIX C

Bibliography

Educational Testing Service, PR-68-4. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Theoretical considerations and measurement strategies. Report in 2 volumes, December 1968, contract OEO 4206 and Grant OEO CG-8256, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Anderson, S. B., & Doppelt, J. (Jt. Chm.) Untangling the tangled web of education. Symposium sponsored by the National Council on Measurement in Education and presented in conjunction with the conferences of Educational Records Bureau and Educational Testing Service, New York, November 1968. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, RM-69-6, 1969.

Educational Testing Service, PR-69-12. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: From theory to operations. August 1969, Grant H 8256, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.